

**REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 24, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 13, 15-16, 20, 22-23, and 27 are amended. Claims 29-48 are added. No claims are canceled. As a result, claims 1-48 are now pending in this application.

**Amendments to the Specification**

Applicant has made several voluntary amendments to the specification.

For example, the subtitle “Technical Field” has been substituted for “Technical Field of the Invention”. The subtitle “Background Information” has been substituted for “Background of the Invention”. The subtitle “Detailed Description” has been substituted for “Detailed Description of Embodiments of the Invention”. The subtitle “Conclusion” has been deleted.

In addition, Applicant has made several amendments to the specification by substituting “embodiments of the invention”, “inventive subject matter”, or “disclosure” for “invention” or “present invention”, and by deleting certain instances of the word “invention”.

Also, in the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 13, the sentence “Such embodiments of the inventive subject matter may be referred to, individually and/or collectively, herein by the term “invention” merely for convenience and without intending to voluntarily limit the scope of this application to any single invention or inventive concept if more than one is in fact disclosed.” has been inserted.

No new matter has been introduced through these amendments to the specification.

**Amendments to Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 13, 15-16, 20, 22-23, and 27**

Each of original claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 13, 15-16, 20, 22-23, and 27 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Independent claim 1 has been amended by adding the phrase “if at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified”.

Dependent claim 2 has been amended by substituting “the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of” for “the data is modified in accordance with one or more data attributes from the group comprising”.

Dependent claim 6 has been amended by switching the claim dependency from claim 5 to claim 2, by substituting “the at least one” for “a”; and by deleting “from the group comprising font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, date, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, color, size, shape, angular orientation, intensity, and position”.

Independent claim 8 has been amended by adding “and at least one data attribute”, and by adding “if at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified”.

Dependent claim 9 has been amended by substituting “, in modifying, the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of” for “the data comprises one or more data attributes, and wherein, in modifying, the computer program comprises the operation of modifying the data in accordance with one or more data attributes from the group comprising”.

Dependent claim 13 has been amended by switching the claim dependency from claim 12 to claim 9; by deleting “wherein the data comprises one or more data attributes, and”; by substituting “the at least one” for “a”; and by deleting “from the group comprising font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, date, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, color, size, shape, angular orientation, intensity, and position”.

Independent claim 15 has been amended by adding “at least one data attribute, the user device further having” and by adding “, if the at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified”.

Dependent claim 16 has been amended by substituting “, in modifying, the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of” for “the data comprises one or more data attributes, and wherein, in modifying, the computer program comprises the operation of modifying the data in accordance with one or more data attributes from the group comprising”.

Dependent claim 20 has been amended by switching the claim dependency from claim 19 to claim 16; by deleting “wherein the data comprises one or more data attributes, and”; by substituting “the at least one” for “a”; and by deleting “from the group comprising font,

paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, date, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, color, size, shape, angular orientation, intensity, and position".

Independent claim 22 has been amended by adding the phrase "if at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified".

Dependent claim 23 has been amended by substituting ", in modifying, the at least one data attribute is selected from the group consisting of" for "the data comprises one or more data attributes, and wherein, the instructions, when accessed by the machine, result in the machine performing: in modifying, modifying the data in accordance with one or more data attributes from the group comprising".

Dependent claim 27 has been amended by switching the claim dependency from claim 26 to claim 23; by deleting "wherein the data comprises one or more data attributes, and"; by substituting "the at least one" for "a"; and by deleting "from the group comprising font, paragraph, page, document, user name, user location, device name, date, time, style name, data type, text, field, file name, cell, color, size, shape, angular orientation, intensity, and position".

#### **New Claims 29-48**

New claims 29-48 have been added to provide Applicant with additional protection to which Applicant is entitled. New claims 29-48 are supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced.

New claims 29-45 are all dependent upon claim 1, and they provide further limitations regarding the "at least one data attribute". Support for the limitations recited in claims 29-43 may be found, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 6, line 4. Support for the limitations recited in claims 44-45 may be found, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 8, line 21, and in the paragraph beginning on page 10, line 11.

New independent claim 46 is identical to independent claim 1, except that the phrase "font attribute" has been substituted for the "data attribute". Support may be found, for example, in original claim 2.

New dependent claim 47 recites that "in modifying, the at least one font attribute is selected from the group consisting of font size, font type, font color, boldface, italics, and

underlining". Support may be found, for example, in lines 5-6 of page 6 of the written description.

New dependent claim 48 recites that "in displaying, the modified data is blurred". Support may be found, for example, in original claim 5.

**Rejection of Claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)  
as Anticipated by Parikh**

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated Parikh (U.S. 5,801,697).

Parikh discloses an information security feature for a laptop computer, in which a visible area (50, FIG. 2) within an overall obscured area (52, FIG. 2) may be defined by user action, e.g. by moving a mouse pointer or in various other ways (col. 2, lines 64-67). The appearance of the obscured area may be varied by the user (col. 2, lines 50-51). The size of the visible area may be varied by the user (col. 3, lines 35-37).

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2D 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). MPEP §2131.

Parikh doesn't disclose all of the structural elements recited in claim 1, as amended. For example, Parikh doesn't disclose "modifying the data to form modified data, if at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified".

In Applicant's inventive subject matter, as recited for example in claim 1, control to modify data for subsequent display is specified by at least one data attribute. In an example discussed on page 6, lines 14-18 of Applicant's written description, a font attribute (e.g. font type, such as "italics") may be used to specify that the data should be modified, e.g. either blurring or disabling blurring of the displayed data. In another example in Applicant's written description, a different font attribute (e.g. font size, such as "large") can be used to specify that the data should be modified, e.g. either blurring or disabling blurring of the displayed data.

For the above reasons, claim 1 should be found to be allowable over Parikh, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Parikh be withdrawn.

Claims 2-7 and 29-45, which depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicant respectfully requests notification of same.

Likewise, amended independent claims 8, 15, and 22, which contain the limitation “if the at least one data attribute specifies that the data should be modified”, and new independent claim 45, which contains the limitation “if the at least one font attribute specifies that the data should be modified”, should also be found to be allowable for the reasons set forth above regarding amended independent claim 1.

In addition, all of the claims dependent upon independent claims 1, 8, 15, 22, and 46 should be allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests notification of same.

**Additional Elements and Limitations**

Applicant considers additional elements and limitations of claims 1-48 to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicant reserves the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

**Documents Cited But Not Relied Upon For This Office Action**

Applicant need not respond to the assertion of pertinence stated for the references cited but not relied upon by the Office Action, because these references are not made part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not admitting to this assertion and reserves the right to address the assertion should it form part of future rejections.

**Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-48 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Walter W. Nielsen (located in Phoenix, Arizona) at (602) 298-8920, or the below-signed attorney (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD O. CLAPPER

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER  
& KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date Dec. 17, 2003

By Ann M. McCrackin

Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 17 day of December, 2003.

Name

KACIA LEE

Signature

Kacia Lee